REMARKS

Claims 1-66 were pending in the application. Claims 3-4, 23-24 and 46-47 have been cancelled without prejudice, and claims 1-2, 5, 10-11, 21-22, 25-27, 31, 44-45, 48-50 and 54 have been amended, leaving claims 1-2, 5-22, 25-45 and 48-66 for consideration upon entry of the present amendment. Support for the amendment can be found on pages 21-23 of the specification or Figs. 2-3 of the Application. No new matter added by the amendment.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 11-18, 21 and 31-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by US 5,751,960 to Matsugana (hereinafter "Matsugana") for the reasons stated on pages 2-5 of the Office Action.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Matsugana, however, does not disclose or suggest that , as claimed in claims 1 and 21.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite a method for providing a status notification or reply for a message in a communications network comprising: <u>assigning a message identifier and a destination identifier to said message in response to a request of said status notification or reply, the destination identifier comprising a destination format and a destination address; storing said message with said message identifier and said destination identifier; and generating said status notification or reply addressed and formatted according to said destination identifier, in response to a triggering event</u>.

In claim 1, the message is formatted and addressed according to a specific instruction of a status notification or reply requestor. The requester, in claim 1, can define the format of the status notification or reply different from a format of an original message. On the contrary, Matsugana administrates electric mails in linking an electronic mail system among electronic mail systems by corresponding a user ID of a forwarding side with a user ID of a destination of the forwarding. The user ID is for administrating an electric mail in a forwarding electric mail system to a destination electric mail system

BS01045
BLL-0054

6

capable of handling the electric mail. Thus, the user ID is not specific for one message but common for all messages having the same format and being in the same electronic mail system (See, col. 10, ll. 40-54 of Matsugana). Thus, Matsugana generates a reply having a text format in response to an electric mail having only the text format. Accordingly, Matsugana neither discloses nor teaches the element: assigning a message identifier and a destination identifier to said message in response to a request of said status notification or reply, the destination identifier comprising a destination format and a destination address, as claimed in claim 1.

A status notification or reply, in claim 1, is only generated in response to a triggering event. Thus, the requester can track a certain event that is determined as the triggering event. On the contrary, there is no event, in Matsugana, for triggering the administration of forwarding the electric mail in linking an electronic mail system among electronic mail systems. Thus, Matsugana neither discloses nor teaches the element: generating said status notification or reply addressed and formatted according to said destination identifier, in response to a triggering event, as claimed in claim 1.

Accordingly, claim 1 is believed to be patentably distinct and nonobvious in view of Matsugana. Claims 11-18 depend from claim 1, thus include all the limitations of amended claim 1. It is thus believed that claims 11-18 are allowable for at least the reasons given for claim 1, which is believed to be allowable.

Claim 21 has been amended to recite a system to provide a status notification or reply for a message in a communications network comprising: a processor for prompting a message sender to assign a message identifier and a destination identifier for said message in response to a request of said status notification or reply, the destination identifier comprising a destination format and a destination address, said processor associating said message identifier and said destination identifier with said message, and said processor generating said status notification or reply addressed and formatted according to said destination identifier, in response to a triggering event.

As described above with regard to claim 1, Matsugana neither discloses nor teaches a processor for promoting a message sender to assign a message identifier and a destination identifier for said message in response to a request of said status notification or reply, the destination identifier comprising a destination format and a destination

BS01045
BLL-0054

7

address, and said processor generating said status notification or reply addressed and formatted according to said destination identifier, in response to a triggering event, as claimed in claim 21.

Accordingly, claim 21 is believed to be patentably distinct and nonobvious in view of Matsugana. Claims 31-38 depend from claim 21, thus include all the limitations of amended claim 21. It is thus believed that claims 31-38 are allowable for at least the reasons given for claim 21, which is believed to be allowable.

Thus, withdrawal of the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103
Claims 2-4, 6-10, 19-20, 22-24, 26-30 and 39-43

Claims 2-4, 6-10, 19-20, 22-24 and 26-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsugana in view of US 4,582,959 to Myslinski et al. (hereinafter "Myslinski") for the reasons stated on pages 6-9 of the Office Action. Even though the Examiner does not indicate that claims 39-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsugana in view of Myslinski, because the rejection reasons of claims 39-43 were stated under Number 5 of the Office Action, claims 39-43 are assumed to be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsugana in view of Myslinski et al.

Since claims 3-4 and 23-24 have been cancelled without prejudice, the rejection of claims 3-4 and 23-24 is moot.

The rejection of claims 2, 6-10, 19-20, 22, 26-30 and 39-43 is based in part on the contention that the combination of Matsugana and Myslinski is legally sufficient as against claim 1. Matsugana, however, does not anticipate or render obvious the invention of claim 1 for the reasons described with regard to the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Myslinski does not cure the deficiency of Matsugana for at least the reasons described below.

Myslinski discloses a message waiting alerting method in which stored messages are retained in memory until specifically deleted by a principal, while automatically alerting principals of the presence of stored messages only when new unaccessed

BS01045
BLL-0054

8

messages are present. Myslinski does not disclose or teach generating a status notification or reply formatted and addressed according to a specific instruction of a request of the notification or reply. Thus, Myslinski neither teaches nor suggests the elements: assigning a message identifier and a destination identifier to said message in response to a request of said status notification or reply, the destination identifier comprising a destination format and a destination address; and generating said status notification or reply addressed and formatted according to said destination identifier, in response to a triggering event, as recited in claims 1 and 21.

Thus, the combination of Matsugana and Myslinski does not render obvious claims 1 and 21.

Claims 2, 6-10 and 19-20 depend from claim 1, and claims 22, 26-30 and 39-43 depend from claim 21. It is thus believed that claims 2, 6-10, 19-20, 22, 26-30 and 39-43 are allowable for at least the reasons given for claims 1 and 21, which are believed to be allowable.

Claims 5 and 25

Claims 5 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsugana in view of Myslinski and in further of US 6,337,899 to Alcendor et al. (hereinafter "Alcendor") for the reasons stated on page 10 of the Office Action.

Alcendor discloses speaker verification for authorizing updates to user subscription service received by internet service provider using an intelligent peripheral in an advanced intelligent network. Alcendor neither teaches nor suggest the elements: assigning a message identifier and a destination identifier to said message in response to a request of said status notification or reply, the destination identifier comprising a destination format and a destination address; and generating said status notification or reply addressed and formatted according to said destination identifier, in response to a triggering event, as recited in claims 1 and 21.

Thus, Alcendor does not cure the deficiency of the combination of Matsugana and Myslinski. Accordingly, the combination of Matsugana, Myslinski and Alcendor does not render obvious claims 1 and 21. Claim 5 depends from claim 1, and claim 25 depends from claim 21. It is thus believed that claims 5 and 25 are allowable for at least the reasons given for claims 1 and 21, which are believed to be allowable.

BS01045
BLL-0054

9

Claims 44, 54-56 and 61-64

Claims 44, 54-56 and 61-64 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsugana in view of U.S. 5,363,431 to Schull et al. (hereinafter "Schull") for the reasons stated on pages 11-13 of the Office Action.

Claim 44 has been amended to recite A system to provide a status notification or reply for a voicemail message in an advanced intelligence network (AIN) comprising an intelligent peripheral operative to: prompt a message sender to assign a message identifier and a destination identifier for said message in response to a request of said status notification or reply, the destination identifier comprising a destination format and a destination address; associate said message identifier and said destination identifier with said message; and generate said status notification or reply addressed and formatted according to said destination identifier, in response to a triggering event.

Matsugana does not teach or suggest the elements: an intelligent peripheral operative to: prompt a message sender to assign a message identifier and a destination identifier for said message in response to a request of said status notification or reply, the destination identifier comprising a destination format and a destination address; and generate said status notification or reply addressed and formatted according to said destination identifier, in response to a triggering event, as claimed in claim 44 for at least the reasons described with regard to the rejections of claims 1 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a).

Schull discloses a visual message waiting indication in a telephone voice message system. Even though Schull discloses an advanced intelligence network comprising an intelligent peripheral and a voice mail, Schull does not cure the deficiency of Matsugana because Schull neither teaches nor suggests the elements: an intelligent peripheral operative to: prompt a message sender to assign a message identifier and a destination identifier for said message in response to a request of said status notification or reply, the destination identifier comprising a destination format and a destination address; and generate said status notification or reply addressed and formatted according to said destination identifier, in response to a triggering event, as claimed in claim 44.

Thus, the combination of Matsugana and Schull does not render obvious claim 44. Claims 54-56 and 61-64 depend from claim 44. It is believed that claims 54-46 and 61-

BS01045
BLL-0054

10

64 are allowable for at least the reasons given for claim 44, which is believed to be allowable.

Claims 45-47, 49-53 and 65-66

Claims 45-47, 49-53 and 65-66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsugana in view of Schull and in further view of Myslinski for the reasons stated on pages 13-16 of the Office Action.

Since claims 46-47 have been cancelled without prejudice, the rejection of claims 46-47 is moot.

As described with regard to the rejections of claims 1, 21 and 44 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the combination of Matsugana, Schull and Myslinski does not teach or suggest the elements: an intelligent peripheral operative to: prompt a message sender to assign a message identifier and a destination identifier for said message in response to a request of said status notification or reply, the destination identifier comprising a destination format and a destination address; and generate said status notification or reply addressed and formatted according to said destination identifier, in response to a triggering event, as claimed in claim 44. Thus the combination of Matsugana, Schull and Myslinski does not obvious claim 44.

Claims 45, 49-53 and 65-66 depend from claim 44. It is thus believed that claims 45, 49-53 and 65-66 are allowable for at least the reasons given for claim 44, which is believed to be allowable.

Claim 48

Claim 48 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsugana in view of Schull, in view of Myslinski and in further view of Alcendor for the reasons stated on page 17 of the Office Action.

As described with regard to the rejections of claims 1, 21 and 44 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the combination of Matsugana, Schull, Myslinski and Alcendor does not teach or suggest the elements: an intelligent peripheral operative to: prompt a message sender to assign a message identifier and a destination identifier for said message in response to a request of said status notification or reply, the destination identifier comprising a destination format and a destination address; and generate said status notification or reply addressed and formatted according to said destination identifier, in response to a

triggering event, as claimed in claim 44. Thus the combination of Matsugana, Schull, Myslinski and Alcendor does not obvious claim 44.

Claim 48 depends from claim 44. It is thus believed that claim 48 is allowable for at least the reasons given for claim 44, which is believed to be allowable.

Claims 57 and 59

Claims 57 and 59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsugana in view of Schull and in further view of Alcendor for the reasons stated on page 18 of the Office Action.

As described with regard to the rejection of claim 48 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the combination of Matsugana, Schull and Alcendor does not obvious claim 44.

Claims 57 and 59 depend from claim 44. It is thus believed that claims 57 and 59 are allowable for at least the reasons given for claim 44, which is believed to be allowable.

Claims 58 and 60

Claims 58 and 60 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsugana in view of Schull, in view of Alcendor and in further view of US 6,498,835 to Skladman (hereinafter "Skladman") for the reasons stated on pages 19-20 of the Office Action.

Skladman discloses a method and system for interfacing a legacy e-mail, voice mail and facsimile system into a unified messaging system. Skladman does not teach or suggest the elements: an intelligent peripheral operative to: prompt a message sender to assign a message identifier and a destination identifier for said message in response to a request of said status notification or reply, the destination identifier comprising a destination format and a destination address; and generate said status notification or reply addressed and formatted according to said destination identifier, in response to a triggering event, as claimed in claim 44. Thus, Skladman dose not cure the deficiency of the combination of Matsugana and Schull. Accordingly, the combination of Matsugana, Schull, Alcendor and Skladman does not render obvious claim 44.

Claims 58 and 60 depend from claim 44. It is thus believed that claims 58 and 60 are allowable for at least the reasons given for claim 44, which is believed to be allowable.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, Applicant submits that the above-identified application is now in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is respectfully requested.

If there are any charges with respect to this response or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account 06-1130 maintained by Applicant's attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,

By

David A. Fox
Registration No. 38,807
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
Customer No. 36192

Date: May 21, 2003

MARKED-UP VERSION OF AMENDMENTS

<u>CLAIM AMENDMENTS</u>

Please cancel claims 3-4, 23-24 and 46-47 without prejudice.

Please amend claims 1-2, 5, 10-11, 21-22, 25-27, 31, 44-45, 48-50 and 54, as shown in marked up form below.

1.   (Amended)   A method for providing a status notification [and]<u>or</u> reply for a message in a communications network comprising:

[(a)] assigning a message identifier <u>and a destination identifier to</u> [for] said message <u>in response to a request of said status notification or reply, the destination identifier comprising a destination format and a destination address</u>;

[(b) receiving a destination identifier for communicating at least one of said status notification and said reply; and

(c) associating said destination identifier with said message;]

<u>storing said message with said message identifier and said destination identifier;</u>
<u>and</u>

<u>generating said status notification or reply addressed and formatted according to said destination identifier, in response to a triggering event.</u>

2.   (Amended)   The method of claim 1, further comprising:

[(d) creating] <u>assigning</u> a disposition identifier <u>to said message to track a change to a status of said message, said disposition identifier responding</u> [in response]to a disposition event<u>, the triggering event comprising the disposition event</u>[; and

(e) associating said disposition identifier with said message].

3.   (Cancelled)

4.   (Cancelled)

BS01045
BLL-0054

14

5.   (Amended)   The method of claim [4] 1, further comprising:

[(k)] billing a party to said message for said [providing] generating of said status notification.

10.   (Amended)   The method of claim [3] 2, wherein said triggering event further comprises [at least one of:

said disposition event; and]

a passage of time.

11.   (Amended)   The method of claim 1, wherein said destination identifier comprises:

an address identifier having said destination address; and

a format identifier having said destination format.

21.   (Amended)   A system to provide a status notification [and] or reply for a message in a communications network comprising:

[(a)] a processor for prompting a message sender to assign a message identifier and a destination identifier for said message in response to a request of said status notification or reply, the destination identifier comprising a destination format and a destination address, said processor associating said message identifier and said destination identifier with said message, and said processor generating said status notification or reply addressed and formatted according to said destination identifier, in response to a triggering event[;

(b) said processor further operative to receive a destination identifier for communicating said status notification; and

(c) said processor further operative to associate said destination identifier with said message].

22.   (Amended)   The system of claim 21, wherein said processor is further operative to[:

(d) create] <u>assign</u> a disposition identifier <u>to said message to track a change to a status of said message, said disposition identifier responding</u> [in response] to a disposition event<u>, said triggering event including said disposition event</u>[; and

(e) associate said disposition identifier with said message].

24.   (Cancelled)

24.   (Cancelled)

25.   (Amended)   The system of claim [24] <u>21</u>, wherein said process is further operative to[:

(k)] bill a party to said message for said [providing]<u>generating</u> of said <u>status notification or</u> reply [option].

26.   (Amended)   The system of claim [23] <u>22</u>, wherein said triggering event <u>further</u> comprises [at least one of:

said disposition event; and]

a passage of time.

27.   (Amended)   The system of claim [26] <u>22</u>, wherein said disposition event comprises at least one of:

a managing event; and

a dispatching event.

31.   (Amended)   The system of claim 21, wherein said destination identifier comprises:

an address identifier <u>having said destination address</u>; and

a format identifier <u>having said destination format</u>.

BS01045
BLL-0054

16

44.   (Amended)   A system to provide a status notification [and]or reply for a voicemail message in an advanced intelligence network (AIN) comprising an intelligent peripheral operative to:

[(a)] prompt a message sender to assign a message identifier and a destination identifier for said message in response to a request of said status notification or reply, the destination identifier comprising a destination format and a destination address;

[(b) receive a destination identifier for communicating a status notification; and

(c)] associate said message identifier and said destination identifier with said message; and

generate said status notification or reply addressed and formatted according to said destination identifier, in response to a triggering event.

45.   (Amended)   The system of claim 44, wherein said intelligent peripheral is further operative to[:

(d) create] assign a disposition identifier to said message to track a change to a status of said message, said disposition identifier responding [in response] to a disposition event, said triggering event including said disposition event[; and

(e) assign said disposition identifier with said message].

47.   (Cancelled)

47.   (Cancelled)

48.   (Amended)   The system of claim 47, wherein said intelligent peripheral is further operative to[:

(k)] bill a party to said message for said [providing] generating of said status notification or reply.

BS01045
BLL-0054

17

49.   (Amended)   The system of claim [46] 45, wherein said triggering event further comprises [at least one of:

a disposition event; and]

a passage of time.

50.   (Amended)   The system of claim [49] 45, wherein said disposition event comprises at least one of:

a managing event; and

a dispatching event.

54.   (Amended)   The system of claim 44, wherein said destination identifier comprises:

an address identifier having said destination address; and

a format identifier having said destination format.